The Reply

$1.00 for the Year | June, 1914 | 10 Cents for the Copy

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

PERIOD. 1ST REC'D
JUN 12 1914
CONGRESS

New York
New Canaan, Conn.

Second Year

Number 2

Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

ANNA KATHERINE GREEN

Who is strongly opposed to Woman Suffrage.

The Reply

Helen S. Harman-Brown, Editor and Publisher

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT NEW YORK, N. Y.
ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO "THE REPLY," 33 W. 42D ST., NEW YORK.

New Canaan Office, care of Chairman of New Canaan Branch of the Connecticut Association Opposed to Women's Suffrage.

The Reply Is on Sale at Brentano's, Fifth Avenue and Twenty-seventh St., New York and at Brentano's, F. and Twelfth Streets, Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

Editorial		25
Female Suffrage	By Charles A. Zenkert	28
A Whole Lot of Fun	By Olive L. Reamy	31
Ex-Governor Curtis Guild at Anti-Suffrage Meeting		33
Wage Earning Women and the Ballot	By F. G. R. Gordon	35
Correspondence with a Leading Suffragist		37
Woman Suffrage in Colorado a Failure		38
Socialism and the Woman Suffrage Movement	By F. G. R. Gordon	39
In a Nutshell		40
Colorado's Decline		41
Woman Suffrage and Socialism		42
A Bishop's Views on Women's Suffrage		44
Suffragism Not Coming and Why		44
Press News and Notes		45
Anti-Suffrage Organizations		47

As the financial support of a magazine comes largely from its success as an advertising medium, we trust that all who want to help the work which THE REPLY has undertaken, will not only read all its advertisements, but patronize its carefully selected advertisers.

STEWART BROWN W. HARMAN BROWN, JR.

FISKE & BROWN

ESTABLISHED 1893

□

IMPORTERS OF

HIGHEST GRADE OLIVE OILS AND OLIVES

□

DEALERS IN

Specially Selected High Quality California Prunes and Glace Fruits
"The Isle of Wight" Virginia Ham
Choicest Packing Canned Vegetables and Fruits
Monadnock Farms Maple Syrup
High Grade Teas and Coffees

Send for Price List

126 WATER STREET, NEW YORK

Parcels Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write, as well as visit our advertisers.

The Reply

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

June, 1914

EDITORIAL

The nine tailors of Tooley Street resolved: "We, the people of England," etc.

The like modest assumption of eight per cent. of the women of America is amusing reading, in the Congressional Record of May 9th. Here we find Mr. Bryan of Washington spreading that parody of our glorious Declaration of Independence—edited by the Suffragists, and dated 1914—upon the records of the House of Representatives. He then proceeds to refer to it as the "Declaration of the Women of the United States" and expresses pride in representing the will of this large constituency. That he is assuming to represent this large body, without authority, is quite evident, and at least ninety per cent. of the women of America will, undoubtedly, resent this MISS-representation. Few of the thinking women—loyal citizens of our country—will be willing to go on record, as this parody puts it, "that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends (the will of these discontented ones) it is the right of the people—women people as well as men people—to alter and ABOLISH it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form AS TO THEM shall seem most likely to effect the safety and happiness of all the people." There is a report that one of the Suffragist leaders on being told that certain of her demands were unconstitutional, advised the destruction of the Constitution, and now we have the declaration of the Suffragists that "We, women of America," will, may-hap, abolish the government which meets with their disapproval, and institute new government "as to them shall seem" best for the rest of us. Eight per cent. of the women of America, to overturn the United States government and re-organize it! This is indeed the Rule of the People! A privileged class—for the voter who is unable to enforce her will must always be receiving this privilege (not Right) through the courtesy of the voter who can—is not to be tolerated, as Democracy is the cornerstone of our institutions. In illustration of women's aptitude for government, Mr. Bryan declares that "the recent proceedings in Colorado afford the most convincing argument for equal suff-

rage that has been presented during all the struggles of women for their political rights." The amusing attitude of the tailors of Tooley Street, and of the suffragists of the United States, fade into insignificance beside this astounding statement. This is followed in the *Record*, by quotations from the Denver *Post* and the *Rocky Mountain Times*, which, if intended to show the value to Colorado of the woman's vote, give a far different impression to the reader. Whatever good influence (if their teasing activities were justified at so critical a time) the women had upon the Governor, could have been quite as effective without as with the vote. Eleventh hour remedies might not have been required had the electorate been alive to its responsibilities before this crisis in the affairs of the state. It has been claimed, heretofore, by Suffragists, that women often cast fifty-one per cent. of the vote of the State of Colorado, but now Alice Stone Blackwell, in the New York *Times* of May 24th, writes that men compose the majority of the Colorado voters. We are lead, by all the advertised statements of the Suffragists, to picture the men of Colorado as supinely leaving every effort for the betterment of conditions in the hands of the women. If, as Miss Blackwell, in contradiction of former claims, asserts that the men voters are in the majority, was the appeal for intervention by the Federal troops one of the successes of the Colorado women? In the light of recent revelations, "Petticoat Rule" seems as disastrous to the men as to the women themselves. Mr. Bryan closes his speech with a somewhat ungenerous attack upon his own sex in Colorado. He says, after again commending the mass meeting of women, which was supposed to have forced Governor Ammon to ask for Federal aid, "A mass meeting of men could not have accomplished it. Men would have fought each other. Men would have palavered about 'States' rights' and 'Colorado's dignity.'" Might it be just possible that in a state not weakened by woman suffrage, a mass meeting of men WOULD NOT have cried for outside help? Men would have FOUGHT FOR THEIR STATE, and men would have UPHELD "States' rights" and "Colorado's dignity" in the eyes of the Nation.

The attitude of the English public towards the "Wild Women" is often a subject of speculation in this country, but a report comes from London, in which Magistrate Hopkins of the Bow Street Police Court accurately describes it. After he had just rejected the application of a suffragette for a summons against an unknown man who, she complained, struck her during the suffragette meeting in Hyde Park last Sunday, while she admitted that the police had rescued her, he said:

"Some day an exasperated crowd will break into a procession of militants. What will then happen to you women nobody knows at present. You have the police to thank for being alive. You owe them a debt of gratitude."

That the English are an intensely loyal people is well known and the attacks on the King have done more to arouse indignation than all the acts of incendiarism and vandalism. When the public heard of the meeting of the Women's Social and Political Union at which

shouts of "Shoot the King!" were raised, resentment knew no bounds. It is generally felt that all that is needed for the suppression of militantism is the withdrawal of police protection.

At a militant meeting at which Mrs. Mildred Mansel who recently served a term of imprisonment for breaking the windows of the war office presided, she referred to the raid on Buckingham Palace last Thursday, when fifty-seven suffragists were arrested, and declared that the royal name and royal office has been disgraced. Every mention of King George's name provoked cries of derision and prolonged hissing.

Public exasperation against these women is also increased owing to the necessity of closing the public art galleries both in London and the Provinces.

We, of America, must keep before us the fact that the suffragists in this country contributed approximately $20,000 to carry on these militant tactics, that American suffrage leaders have prophesied that while not yet "necessary," conditions may arise to make them advisable here, and *that we hear no official repudiation* of these sentiments.

In view of the above it is interesting to recall that in her address at the Rensselaer Chamber of Commerce meeting in Albany Mrs. Gavit disclaimed the name "Suffragette," alleging that that name was applicable only to what she called the "militant" members, and that "militant" methods had not yet been found "necessary" in this country. As she did not breathe a syllable in condemnation of them, a fair inference is that American "suffragists" think they may find the destruction of property "necessary" some day, perhaps on the rejection of the female suffrage amendment to the constitution which everybody anticipates in 1915.

"Now that the women of Kansas have the right to vote for Congressmen, Joe Taggart has sent a letter to all soldiers' widows promising to see that their pensions are increased. Neeley, another Democrat, is sending out the same kind of a letter to his women constituents.—Ottawa (Kan.) Guardian."

The above excerpt from the Woman's Journal is good reading for those of us who have pointed out the strange similarity of voters and would-be-voters. Notwithstanding, we have been lead to understand that bribery and corruption would go out of fashion as soon as woman's direct influence in politics was felt, we note the above, quoted on the editorial page of the leading suffrage paper. We cannot ask for stronger endorsement of graft than herein suggested. Is our $175,085,451 annual pension roll to be doubled, as well as our vote?

We would draw the attention of readers of THE REPLY to the fact that the National Grange, in meeting at Seattle, Washington, did not endorse the Woman Suffrage movement, which adverse action was followed at Concord, N. H., as well as by the New York State Grange at Poughkeepsie, Buffalo and Troy. We have heard repeatedly from the suffragists of favorable action on the part of the Grange, but somehow little comes to us of their defeats. That "Suffrage is coming" is growing a fainter and fainter cry.

Female Suffrage

SOME CATHOLIC VIEWS.

By Charles A. Zenkert.

NOT so long ago, the notion was prevalent that the Catholic Church on principle discountenanced the political emancipation of women. A cynically disposed person might have been inclined to explain this fact on the ready-made theory that an institution which drew its inspiration from the past might be expected to frown on any innovation, while his more broad-minded neighbor might have been moved to a different conclusion, having persuaded himself that a church which had experimented with human nature for so many centuries would in all probability assume a safe and sound attitude anent the political phase of the woman question.

These speculations have, however, for the moment, turned into another direction. Two years ago, a Catholic Women's Suffrage Society was formed in Great Britain. Within the past year, a St. Catherine of Sienna Welfare League has been organized in New York City to promote the Votes-for-Women cause. The press has given accounts of woman suffrage meetings held under Catholic auspices. Leaflets have been distributed giving indorsements of woman suffrage by several Catholic prelates. Developments such as these may have tended to convey the popular impression that after all the Catholic Church was favoring the enfranchisement of women, the realization of which would undoubtedly inure to her political advantage in case she chose to exert her influence in this direction.

However, things are not what they seem. This advocacy of woman suffrage by individual Catholics does not reflect the attitude of the Catholic body as such. The great mass of Catholics hold woman suffrage in disfavor. A small number of individual Catholics espousing the cause of woman suffrage have commanded public attention precisely because of their singular and anomalous deportment. Obviously, the opinions of half a dozen individuals who advertise their views do not balance on the scales with those of a thousand others who are otherwise persuaded, but do not choose to shout their convictions from the house-tops. As Edmund Burke put it a century ago: "Because half a dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importune chinks, while thousands of great cattle repose in the shade and are silent, pray do not think that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field; or that, after all, they are other than the little, meagre, hopping, though loud and troublesome insects of the hour."

The Catholic Church has, indeed, made no doctrinal pronouncement, but there is a Catholic philosophy of life defining the rights and duties of man and woman in the family and in society.

Is Catholic moral philosophy indifferent to the attempt to bring about such a sweeping change in the status of woman as her enfranchisement would entail?

Unfortunately there is no special work in the English language on the woman question which specifically discusses the political phase of the woman question in the light of Catholic philosophy. The Catholic Encyclopedia, however, contains an excellent article on the woman question, to which reference will be made further on. The English-speaking Catholics have been slower in devoting their attention to social problems than their German brethren in faith. Thus several books have been published in the German language by recognized authorities on the woman question. Father Victor Cathrein, S.J., is the author of a work, "Die Frauenfrage" (Woman Question), in which he devotes a special chapter to the political emancipation of women. Father Cathrein is likewise the author of another standard Catholic work, "Moralphilosophie," also published in German, while his Latin "Philosophia Moralis" is used as a text book in hundreds of Catholic seminaries. To English readers Father Cathrein is known through his scholarly contributions to the Catholic Encyclopedia.

In the opening paragraph of the chapter on woman suffrage in the book referred to above, Father Cathrein says:

"The movement in favor of emancipation has developed such strength that one need not assume the role of prophet in order to predict its final realization though not for the immediate future. This circumstance, however, does not excuse us from the task of investigating the principles upon which it is sought to be justified. A good deal has been established against which we Catholics must protest with might and main, thus, for instance, civil marriage and divorce. ...Much has been done which one would rather see undone. Therefore, the fact that political emancipation will probably be realized, is no reason for its justification on principle.

"If I speak of the Catholic viewpoint, I must add that it is not a question of a Catholic dogma. The Church has not passed any definite decision on this question, and will not do so in the near future. But the political emancipation of woman, according to my estimation, inevitably leads to consequences which hardly can be reconciled with the teachings of the Church with regard to the mission and status of the two sexes especially in the family, and it is precisely for this reason that I feel constrained to pronounce against it."

The well-being of the family is the issue at stake, according to Father Cathrein. The family is the unit of society and the prototype of all forms of society. Individuals are merged in society through the family. As Pope Leo XIII declares in his memorable encyclical, "Rerum Novarum," "the child takes its place in society not in its own right, but in its quality as a member of the family"; and again, "If the citizens of a State—that is to say, the families, on entering into association, etc."

The welfare of society is conditioned on the well-being of the family; hence the perpetuation of the Christian family is the task of the hour. Man is the head of the family; woman, its heart. As the heart is the vitalizing center of the organism, whence blood and life

communicate to all members, so woman is the vitalizing center of the family, from which life and development issue. This is the sphere which Providence has assigned to her. This, her divinely ordained position in the family, engrosses all her time and attention. In the political activity of woman, Father Cathrein finds a serious menace to the well-being of the family in that it tends to make the heart function in a sphere which nature has assigned to the head and brain.

The same conclusion is reached by Father Augustine Roessler in the German work "The Woman Question in the Light of Nature, History and Revelation." The article on "Woman" in the Catholic Encyclopedia was contributed by Father Roessler. The latter being more accessible, it is here referred to.

Father Roessler insists that in order to judge rightly the efforts known as the "woman movement" the rights and duties of woman in the life of humanity must be correctly stated. Woman shares equally with man in human dignity. The moral equality of the sexes calls for the same moral law, not for a dual standard. Physiological differences, however, produce different manifestations of human nature in man and woman, while the social spheres of interests and callings of the sexes are unlike. Humanity cannot be represented by any number, however large, of individuals of like sex, but is to be found solely in the social and organic union of man and woman.

"The third branch of the woman question," says Father Roessler, "the social legal position of woman, can, as shown from what has been said, only be decided by Catholics in accordance with the organic conception of society, but not in accordance with disintegrating individualism. Therefore the political activity of man is and remains different from that of woman, as has been shown above. It is difficult to unite the direct participation of woman in the political and parliamentary life of the present time with her dominant duty as a mother. If it should be desired to exclude married women or to grant women only the actual vote, the equality sought for would not be attained. On the other hand, the indirect influence of women which in a well-ordered state makes for the stability of the moral order would suffer severe injury by political equality. The compromise in favour of the direct participation of women in political life which has of late been proposed here and there by Catholics can be regarded, therefore, as a half-measure. The opposition expressed by many women to the introduction of woman suffrage, as, for instance, the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, should be regarded by Catholics, at least, as the voice of common sense."

It is, of course, impossible to discuss at length, in a short article such as this, the views of such recognized authorities in Catholic philosophy as Fathers Cathrein and Roessler, but what has here been set forth may be a new angle from which to gauge Catholic sentiment relative to the political emancipation of women.

A member of Congress (name suppressed out of charity for him) has entered his six-weeks-old baby, a girl, in the suffrage organization of Washington City as a "bona fide suff."

Votes for babies!

A Whole Lot of Fun

By Olive L. Reamy.

ACCORDING to newspaper reports, the Suffragists have opened, in Nassau Street, New York, a little theatre in which the parts are played by paper dolls—suitable to the paper arguments they are intended to advance. One of the plays, "Madam, Who Runs Your House?" is thus described:

"In the foreground is seen the interior of a little house. The mistress sits in the parlor with her hands tied. In the kitchen is a maid preparing food; upstairs a child is ill. Two other children come out of the house and go to school at the back of the stage. In the background rises the City Hall, its windows marked "Board of Health," "Board of Education," "Food Inspector," &c. Into these windows run threads from the sick child, the children going to school, and the food in the kitchen."

This is touching, nay, appealing—to one's sense of the ridiculous. It is doubtless intended to convey the impression that the mother's hands are tied by lack of the ballot, but one wonders where the father of the children is. If he is away at work for money to feed, clothe, and house his family, one questions why his devotion to their welfare should suddenly relax when he enters the voting booth. If the trouble is merely that he doesn't know how to vote properly, one wonders again why his wife, being better informed, as we are lead to believe, does not take the trouble to instruct him. Indeed one almost doubts the superior intelligence of a woman who will marry a man so short-sighted as to work, day in and day out, year in and year out, for his wife and children and then knowingly elect, year after year, government officials who will exercise their powers in such a way as to endanger the health and general well-being of those for whom he is spending his life energies so unstintedly. And if he does not know how wickedly he is voting, how should his wife know? The maze of wonder grows. Let us turn from the state of mental confusion which inquiry into suffragist reasoning always leads and consider some of the effective paper plays that the Anti-Suffragists might stage.

Persons interested in food legislation have asserted with shameless effrontery that the good effects of food laws and food inspection are practically nullified by the conditions surrounding the storage and preparation of the food stuffs in the homes of the land.

This suggests a stage play with the scene laid in—let us say, Denver. In a room in the City Hall sits a disconsolate group of men labeled "Board of Health." On the wall hangs a placard with a long list of measures for the protection and promotion of the health of the community—but the hands of the men are bound by steel cords and these cords

extend into the rooms of the surrounding houses, where careless cooks are disregarding all health measures, and where indifferent nurse-maids are tending their charges as their ignorant caprice prompts, while the parlors are either empty, or occupied by women so intent on the political shell of the nation's welfare that the core is being ruined by the paid substitutes for mothers and home-makers.

We might picture another room in which the Board of Education sits, also with tied hands, looking in dismay at the poor material offered them for transformation into competent citizens, and bewailing the procession of frivolous and self-seeking teachers who enter the school-buildings through a wide door marked "High Salaries," and soon depart through a door marked "Matrimony," while men leading wives and little ones look longingly at congenial work to which they would devote their lives, but from which they are barred by the size of the door marked "Low Salaries," through which they must enter. The highest efficiency is shut out.

Then we might have an army of immaculately clad food inspectors standing on a lofty platform labeled "Food Excellence," and throwing packages of perfectly good food into perfectly sanitary chutes which end in dark holes called kitchens. If this were in Chicago, it might add strength to the argument if a few billion disease germs floated gaily out of the windows to add to the problems of the Board of Health, while cooks and mistresses were out electioneering, or voting, for Bathhouse John.

As a pastime this making of plays is alluring. The Juvenile Courts, upheld by women for the reclamation of their ill-guided offspring, offer a rich field. Feminism, in foolish garb, with a fancy broom in her hands, sweeping away the last remains of the homes where mothers have lived and loved and reigned, would be rather effective.

And in the end, what does it all amount to? Only this, that women have made a botch of their work and some of them are raising a loud cry to cover their inefficiency. They made the men who are, according to them, bungling things, and the only remedy is to make better men. Character can't be created by legislation—and neither can legislation profit by the votes of those who, having the opportunity, do not make character.

The startling statement that the duty, the profession and the burden of motherhood are denied to men is worthy of almost any distinguished doctor of medicine—like Havelock Ellis, for example.

* * *

"It has long been apparent," says the New York Times, "that the (female) suffragists are never willing to admit that there are two sides to their case." More treason.

* * *

And now "General" Rosalie Jones has donated an automobile to her fellow hikers. Runabout, most likely.

* * *

Socialist Suffragists? Suffragist Socialists? It's all the same.

Ex-Governor Curtis Guild at Anti Suffrage Meeting

Faneuil Hall, April 28, 1914.

N taking the chair Mr. Guild said:

The very existence of a republican form of government depends upon the willingness of the minority to accept the rule of the majority, to accept honest differences of opinion as a matter of course and to remember that those who do differ with us are quite as much entitled to free speech without interruption or disorder as we are.

I am delighted to note that the Women's Suffrage meeting at Tremont Temple was orderly and undisturbed and I am sure that the same temper will prevail here.

It was the curse of Athens that caused her downfall that her people were too excitable, perpetually given to a search for novelty and only anxious for perpetual change. Something new is not invariably something good—anarchy and socialism, both extremes of social order have been preached for ages as the coming system but they have not come and it is to be hoped they will never come.

Now nobody denies that woman is the equal of man, not merely his natural companion but his complement supplementing in influence what he contributes to the State in action. We contend, however, that being not merely in body but in brain differentiated from man, that each sex should do the work it is best fitted by nature to do—you would not set a monkey to pulling a sledge nor a dog to climbing trees.

The power to make laws carries with it the duty to enforce law. Whoever makes law, man alone must bear the burden of enforcing it. This demand of a citizen's privilege by those who cannot, by a barrier of nature, enforce the laws they make, seems inconsistent, especially when it is remembered that a majority of men may actually be forced even to risk their lives against their will and judgment by the combined votes of some hysterical men and a mass of hysterical women.

The sincerity and honesty of those who seek woman's suffrage is not to be questioned but the burden of proof is on them to show how it would improve the world. They have as yet failed to show how the old fashioned family will be happier by a defiance of nature's laws or how government is improved or bettered by the assumption by the wife of the position of the husband. Underlying all the happiness of the people is the influence of a good home. Not by declamation from a soap box on the corner but by the womanly exercise of love and guardianship and caution at the head of her own home with her husband and her children, does woman do her best for her country. The mother of George Washington probably had more influence on

the history of the United States than any other woman that ever lived in it, but she exercised it modestly, discreetly, not in mannish fashion but in a woman's way.

Women are supposed to be more moral than men. In resistance to the two vices that appeal more particularly to a man's passions they are. But are they more moral in the citizen's peculiar virtues: Which sex is the more observant of the strict truth? Which sex in comments on public servants is the more apt to drag in incidents of private life and personalities? Which sex before the custom house examiner, for example, has the greater respect for an oath? Which sex on the whole excels in conducting public meetings and elections with order and decorum?

It is a fact that as in the days of the Terror in France the women were more savage than the men, so today in Lawrence, in Colorado, the women are the more frantic part of any mob, secure in their sex against the return blow of the assaulted. In the only riot I ever saw at Victor, Colorado, the first blow was struck by a woman with a huge crucifix which she was carrying to show her admiration for Bryan's cross of gold speech in favor of the repudiation of the National Debt.

Woman's suffrage did not prevent Colorado from leading the country against honest money. It hasn't prevented Seattle from re-electing her red light mayor. It hasn't promoted prosperity in Australia. On the contrary the per capita debt in Australia is over $310. In the United States it is less than $75. Australia with a new country and, except her unwise laws, every possible inducement to settlers backed with the expenditure of thousands of dollars in advertising to induce somebody, anybody to settle there, gained in ten years less than a million in population. The United States, in spite of all our restriction of immigration, gained in the same time under man-made laws but with no more such inducements in cheap lands as Canada and Australia can still offer, sixteen millions in population.

The great masses of intelligent women do not want the suffrage. Our antagonists must really know this. Otherwise why should they oppose submitting the question of women's suffrage to the women of Massachusetts and trust their cause to the gallantry of men alone, fighting not with their sisters face to face but through man's great weakness, his unwillingness to offend or hurt the opposite sex. Judith would have prevailed over Delilah but the male champion of Israel fell not before the Philistines but before the woman he loved.

MERE MAN'S CHRONIC SPRING CROW.

When Mrs. Confab named the owl
(A gift from country cousin Gregg)
"Ben Franklin," she misjudged the fowl—
Ben, in due season, laid an egg.

O wise bird! teach club maids and wives
(For welfare of the sons of men)
That resoluting all their lives
Won't make a rooster of a hen.

—A. B. C. Exchange.

Shame on the sandwich suffragists of Washington for taking the sandwiches out of the mouths of the sandwichmen!

Wage Earning Women and the Ballot

By F. G. R. Gordon.

UNDER the above title Leonora O'Reilly a leading socialist-suffragist writes a column and a half in the N. Y. Daily Call, (the socialist organ of most importance in this country), and she makes many mis-statements. She says that the wage earning women who demand the ballot maintain that the women need it in the interest of humanity. That is mere assertion. What law or policy do the wage earning women expect to get through the ballot that they cannot get with much less effort without it? Then this woman socialist-suffragist tells us that it is woman's mission to bring peace and that it is woman's work to accomplish all this. History shows that some of the meanest and worst wars in the history of the human race have been fought under the rule of queens. And what about the war in England which the women suffragists are now carrying on? Then she tells us a most important thing, namely: That as all civilizations of the past have been established by war the civilization of the future to which she says all women suffragists who are sincere are committed, is a civilization based upon industry which is Socialism as she sees it. Now mark you this: Miss O'Reilly says that all suffragists who are sincere want this form of government and society. In other words, the plain English of what this leading suffragist-socialist says is that any woman suffragist who don't believe in Socialism as the final goal for society is not sincere in her demand for suffrage.

Then she says that man government has brought boss rule and corruption. In Colorado the ladies have had about twenty years of suffrage and what about corruption there? Have the ladies reformed the politics of that state? The best answer is that even the suffragists don't claim that they have.

Another point about this boss rule: She says that "Democracy with man as the unit has brought us boss rule and corruption," yet she thinks, as all socialists do, that the cure for the failure of democracy is more democracy. And then she tells us that the only way to wipe out "plutocracy" is to establish an industrial democracy, which is a confession and a contradiction. A confession that political democracy is "no good" and a contradiction of her first statement that with full democracy, that is, woman suffrage, we would cure the evil of the present democracy. And she adds that the vote of the women is necessary to bring this about. Then this socialist-suffragist goes on to tell us that 1,752,187 children between ten and fifteeen years of age are at work in this country. She evidently wants us to believe that these children are employed in the mills and mines of the nation. She don't tell us that only a little over 8,000 are in the mines, nearly all of whom are over 14; nor does she tell us that only 161,000 are in the mills. She knew that more than a million of this child labor was on the farms, and were found at work

in the month of June, by the census authorities. At work because they ought to be too, for one reason. Then she tells us that there are 500,000 feeble-minded in this country. What does she know about it? The census reports show that there were 20,755 feeble-minded in institutions of the country in the year 1912, and the best estimates of the total number in the nation are from 100,000 to 150,000. Then this suffragist-socialist tells us that 73 per cent. of all the money we raise for government is expended for war and the cost of war. This is far from the truth. If she meant only the Federal taxes, she is wrong for out of an annual cost of $1,000,000,000 about $425,000,000 are expended for the army, the navy and pensions. But if she meant all taxation, then she is far and away from the truth, for we expended for government last year the enormous sum of more than $3,000,000,000 and less than 20 per cent. of it went for war or the cost of war. All of which shows what a calamity howler a socialist-suffragist can be. Then this suffragist-socialist tells us that with woman suffrage we will proceed to abolish the white slave traffic. Have the suffrage states or the suffragist nations abolished it? They have not. She says that wage earning women suffragists will demand a universal child labor law. It was man who demanded this years ago, and the suffrage states have not done any more for this kind of a law than have other states. And she ends her red flag socialist-suffragist story by demanding that there must be a society in which the full fruit of their labor shall be given to all who labor. No one in organized society ever received or ever will receive the full fruit of their labor. The only form of society or rather individualism in which this is possible is either Anarchism or a Robinson Crusoe existence.

But, the socialist-suffragists imagine that they can convert the nation to their cause by wholesale calamity howling on the one hand and by the promise of a heaven on earth existence on the other, for such is the Kingdom of the Suffragist-Socialists.

MAYOR GETS A TOAST.

No Suffragist is Suspected of Mailing It to City Hall.

The effects of the recent attacks upon Mayor Mitchel by suffragists because of the Mayor's speech at Carnegie Hall last week, continue to be felt at the City Hall. This poem, without any signature, was found yesterday in the Mayor's mail:

A TOAST.

Saturday evening, May 2.

"Here's to the woman of days gone by,
(May we meet her kind above.)
The woman for whom a man would die,
The woman who ruled by love!
Who didn't harangue and who didn't parade,
In whose home it was sweet to dwell;
Who believed in raising children
And not in raising ——"

The Mayor had no comment to make on it.

The Boy Scouts of Philadelphia refused to parade with the female suffragists; that was the particular kindness that they could not do that day.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH A LEADING SUFFRAGIST

Since the first issue appeared, THE REPLY has received many letters, anonymous and signed, some addressed to the editor by personal (Suffrage) friends, all somewhat along the lines of the following post card:

"Please remove my name from your mailing list. The REPLY is so full of lies that I consider it would be a disgrace to my family to have it in the house for one night.

"(Signed) Mrs. John Rogers, Jr.

"102 East 30th Str., New York City"

We answered Mrs John Rogers Jr. with what seemed a "retort courteous" in the May Number as follows, suppressing the name of our correspondent.

"A SUFFRAGIST'S RETORT.

"A leading suffragist to whom, at the suggestion of a friend, we sent a copy of The Reply, answers the attention with the following, written on a postal card: 'Please remove my name from your mailing list. The Reply is so full of lies that I consider it would be a disgrace to have it in the house for one night.' It is to be hoped that this good woman is an exception among her party, for it hardly augurs well for the unbiased government to be expected from women if they cannot even read the views of the opposition. However little we agree with their expressed opinions, The Reply acknowledges its debt to the suffrage organs for its information in regard to suffragists' activities and views."

Since, however, receiving the following letter we feel justified in publishing it as an example of Suffrage methods:

"From Mrs. Rogers, Jr.

"102 East 30th Str., New York City.

"The Reply,

"Dear Sirs—Please remove my name from your mailing list. I do not know who told you to send the REPLY to me, but I wish you would inform the person that I will not have the magazine sent to my house. Every member of my family are ardent Suffragists and feel not the least interest in the Anti-Suffragists and so THE REPLY goes into the fire the moment it comes, without a soul reading one word in it, so you see, there is no use in your wasting stamps. But I object to having it even left at my door by the postman. I wrote to New Canaan, telling them to cease sending it to me, and now I write the New York office, with the same request.

Yours truly,

Elizabeth S. Rogers."

How then did the well known Suffrage Leader know that a friend had suggested our sending her this copy of THE REPLY?

AS CIVILIZATION GOES FEMINISM COMES.

"Feminism," writes "A. H. C." to the Evening Sun, in reply to "R. E. L.," evidently a woman, "is no new thing. It is a marsh light that flickers up in civilizations that are getting corrupt and near their end. Greek thought, from the Sophists onward, contained all the speculations of the "advanced" woman of to-day. "She would rather fight thrice in battle than bear children once," Euripides makes one of his characters assert 440 years before Christ. When Rome was falling the Roman women were celebrated for their divorces, their

plunging into men's occupations and their throwing off all moral control. Whenever men are losing their virility, feminism raises its head.

"Most unsexed women (that is women who have lost all but the physical characteristics of their sex) want polyandry. But the logical polyandrist is the woman of the underworld, and yet "R. E. L." and her friends persecute and condemn her. This is 'judgment independent of experience or reflection' with a vengeance!"

A PERSONAGE.

She loomed big in the eye of the public, and occupied no inconsiderable space in the community.

Weighed in the balance, she was never found wanting, nor could any accuse her of lightness.

She was the largest contributor to "votes for women" and the stoutest opponent of the "antis."

Her husband declared that she was altogether too much for him.

Her banker found in her a woman of substance.

Her pastor deemed her a well-rounded character.

Her admirers called her a great lady.

And the women all called her fat.

—*May Lippincott's.*

One good thing about the determination of the Jersey female suffragists to prove how self-sacrificing they are willing to be for "the cause" by wearing their last year's clothes is that they were doubtless wearing more clothes last year than this.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO A FAILURE.

George Creel in the March Century asks,

"Has equal suffrage failed?"

He says, if so, the mass of men wish to fight its spread. His article appears to have made out a strong case for the affirmative. He speaks of the venal legislature of Colorado, and the corrupt council of Denver.

If this existed after nearly twenty years of suffrage, certainly woman's vote is not a panacea for all evils. He cites as "woman's laws" thirty-four in Colorado. Of these twenty exist in all or many non-suffrage states, and good or bad cannot fairly be charged to woman. Six are of little importance, and I think most intelligent men would regard eight as important and very bad.

He says there is not an instance on record of divorce caused by suffrage. As I understand this is not a legal cause for divorce yet, there is no reason for expecting to find it on record, any more than a divorce caused by baldness. That politics in Colorado have recently been corrupt is a matter of proof and record.

If any better today Mr. Creel's demand for the Governor's impeachment proves that in his opinion, equal suffrage is sometimes a failure.

That Mr. Creel held an office in Denver might not seem to him, proof of failure in equal suffrage, while to some others it would.

Has he proved equal suffrage a failure in Colorado?

I think so, what do you think?

F. W.

Socialism and the Woman Suffrage Movement

By F. G. R. Gordon.

The woman suffrage movement in Italy is entirely logical at least. In the first place in the past two or three elections in Italy for Parliament the suffragists largely aided the socialists, both in organization work and in contribution of funds for their propaganda. The suffragists were largely responsible for the election of eighty socialist deputies in the last election. And now the suffragists have taken another logical step and have voted to join the Socialist movement. They state that the socialist organization of Italy and of all other countries is making the best and most effective fight for equal suffrage, and they believe that by joining the two forces together the propaganda for "votes for women" will be made much more effective. In Norway where the women vote the socialists have polled 50,000 votes and elected 1,803 socialists to municipal councils alone, 45 of whom are women. The voting strength of the socialists of that country has greatly increased with the vote for women.

Mrs. Pankhurst and her husband both were prominent socialists before he died and she is one now, yet, being indicted for crimes of inciting to riots, burning of buildings, destruction of the mails, etc., etc., and being a socialist too, yet, when it was thought that this female lunatic might be debarred from this country what happened? Why the suffragists raised Hail Columbia to get her in, so that she might raise some $20,000 or more to carry back to England in order that a few more buildings might be dynamited, or a few more members of Parliament might be horsewhipped. Oh, no, the American suffragist is not for militancy, not on your life, but, they are mighty mad if you say anything against those female socialist-anarchist-militants of England. Why?

COLORADO WOMEN'S VOTES FAILURES.

"Mother Jones" Makes the Statement At a Socialistic Meeting in Harlem.

"Mother Jones" spoke last night to 500 persons at a meeting held under the auspices of the Harlem Socialists' Forum in Pabst's Coliseum, One Hundred and Tenth Street and Fifth Avenue. She said that woman suffrage in Colorado was a failure.

"Women have been voting out there for twenty-one years," she said, "and it is the most oppressed State in the Union. Many of these women voters only think of going to the latest tango, wearing their jewels, arranging their hair in the most becoming way and getting their photographs in the Sunday papers."

It seems that out in Colorado, where the well-known woman has the justly celebrated vote, one candidate for office has frequently been discovered holding the calf for the farmer while the other candidate was holding the baby for the farmer's wife.

IN A NUTSHELL.

In the May-day demonstration of the Suffragists, some of their speakers who had gathered little knots of hearers by displaying the jaundiced flag, spent their breath mainly on the text "consent of the governed," and pleaded for permission to take part in the governing. No doubt they are honest—most of them, at least; but they are obsessed by a fallacy. They assume that governing consists only in saying something; whereas governing consists not only in saying something but in compelling obedience to that which is said. Those women can say something, as we all know; but they do not govern, even in the suffrage States, for the reason that the Creator has not equipped them for compelling obedience to that which is said. And the men who do govern, in all the States, govern more for the protection and advantage of the women than for their own. Why not recognize the simple truth, and acknowledge it? There is nothing much better than the truth. In the suffrage State of Colorado a great deal of difficult compelling has been necessary recently, and it has all been done by men.

The Suffragists say:

That taxation without representation is tyranny;

That just representation without the ballot is impossible.

The Anti-Suffragists say:

That minors, aliens, and non-residents have no votes;

That, if the interests of women tax-payers cannot be properly represented by their husbands, fathers, brothers, and friends, the interests of alien and non-resident tax-payers are more inadequately represented by strangers;

That, if one class is to be freed from tyranny by enfranchisement, all should be freed in like manner.

But, one person may own property in several states, or in several districts in the same state. He cannot be represented by ballot in all unless he is permitted to vote by mail, or proxy.

If each tax-payer has the right to vote wherever he holds taxable property, our government will eventually become an aristocracy instead of a democracy, being dominated by the holders of many scattered properties, no matter how small.

In addition, the quality of the electorate would be weakened by the admixture of immature minors, uninformed aliens, indifferent non-residents, and easily misguided women.

If, on the other hand, the Suffragists gain their illogical demand for the enfranchisement of only the women victims of their so-called tyranny, all tax-payers will find themselves in a worse position than now, because the percentage of non-tax-paying voters will be increased and taxation will need to be heavier to meet the heightened cost of elections with a doubled electorate.

An article in the Century Magazine declares that female suffrage is sweeping eastward like a prairie fire, and evidently the editor of the Century doesn't care what he prints.

* * *

The news that Upton Sinclair, the super-militant and anti-Rockefeller suff, intended to declare a fatal hunger strike proved too good to be true.

COLORADO'S DECLINE.

Where Is the Progress of Which Suffrage Orators Boast?

Rarely have I sat through a suffrage meeting at which a great deal about Colorado was not said. I have again and again heard suffrage orators speak of it as a model State, in which political and social conditions are vastly superior to those of other States. I have listened while a speaker enumerated a long list of laws, all alleged to be on the statute books of Colorado, most of which I should pronounce good, provided they are wisely drawn and intelligently enforced. And always has the speaker, by the plainest inference, amounting in many cases to direct assertion claimed all the credit for whatever is good in present-day legislation in Colorado for her women, who, it is alleged, far from being mere passive addition to the electorate, are the most active element among the voters. I have heard one suffragist of national reputation assert that "the women of Colorado have taken her government firmly in hand and may be said to run that great State."

But suddenly, in a most dreadful and dramatic manner, Colorado stands revealed as a State in which government has completely broken down. So inept and inefficient has she shown herself that she has been compelled to admit that she cannot enforce her own laws and to go to the humiliating length of begging for Federal aid. Now, either the information disseminated by the suffragists in regard to this State is erroneous, or the women voters are largely responsible for this sad condition of affairs.

Those of us who have turned our attention to Colorado lately, having been impelled to do so by the insistence of the suffragists, have some time been aware that something is wrong with that State. Mind, I do not say that the "something" is woman-suffrage; but I do think that, whatever it is, it would repay a little study on the part of the suffragists. Since the days when Edward O. Wolcott and Henry M. Teller gave Colorado a standing in the United States Senate out of all proportion to her general importance, there has been a steady and marked deterioration in the calibre of her public servants. Other States have purified their elections, but Colorado's remain corrupt. The movement that has resulted in the reforming and transforming of government throughout the country, though it had its inception in the West, seems not yet to have reached Colorado. She elected Guggenheim to the Senate in the same year that New Jersey dropped Dryden. The "great leaders" of whom she now boasts are men like Judge Lindsey, who, undoubtedly sincere and well meaning, are so lacking in balance and judgment that they frequently injure the excellent causes they espouse.

Leon Guerin,
In the New York Times.

Englewood, N. J., May 4, 1914.

"That the exercise of the right of suffrage by women and their general intrusion in public and political affairs," says the New York Times editorially, "would result chiefly in depriving women of the tender regard of men we firmly believe." This is treason, and the suffs will make the most of it!

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND SOCIALISM.

To the Editor of the Press (Paterson):

Sir: Your issue of April 23d published a letter from F. G. R. Gordon of Massachusetts, entitled "Socialism and Woman Suffrage." Will you publish the following written by Alice Stone Blackwell? Respectfully,

K. T. C.

Paterson, April 28th, 1914.

"In these days the constant war cry of the opponents of equal rights for women is that 'suffrage means Socialism.' When they say that 'suffrage means Socialism,' they must imply that granting votes to women will mean the speedy bringing in of the Socialist state.

"Now, the Socialists themselves do not think so. All Socialists have woman suffrage as a plank in their theoretical platform, but many of them confess that they do not want it to come until Socialism comes, just because they believe that it would delay the coming of Socialism.

"The Socialist party admits women to membership on the same terms as men, but not nearly as many women as men have joined it. But in every state where women have had the ballot long enough to compare Presidential election with Presidential election, the growth of the Socialist vote was below the average. The general public does not know these things, but the Socialists know them. They are aware that in the United States not nearly as many women as men believe in Socialism. Hence there is a sharp division of opinion among the Socialists, the more consistent members of the party standing up for women suff-

(*Continued on page* 43)

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND SOCIALISM.

To the Editor of the Press:

Sir: Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, with all due respect to the lady, is talking through her bonnet when she attempts to discuss Socialism or what the Socialists of the world have done and are doing for the cause of "votes-for-women." It would be a God-send to the "cause" if the Socialists would only repudiate woman suffrage, for the suffragists, but they never have and never will. All over the world woman suffrage and Socialism are pretty closely allied. In Europe they are practically one. It is woman suffrage that has aided the Socialistic labor party of Australia to put upon the statute books the many Socialistic laws of that land, and so it is in Finland.

In Italy the Woman Suffrage Association has voted to join the Socialists. Mrs. Pankhurst is a Socialist and the real leader of the suffrage cause in England. This Socialist-suffrage lady, who is under indictment of inciting to crimes in England, was uproarlessly applauded and defended by the suffragists of this country, when she came here to raise some thousands of dollars so that she might return to England and encourage her followers to do more dynamiting, more destruction of property and other crimes.

Miss Blackwell says that Socialists, or many of them, don't want suffrage until they (Socialism) come into power. This is not true and I challenge any woman suffragist in New Jersey to disprove what I say. The only great industrial state that can give us any illustration of

(*Continued on page* 43)

rage, while the opportunist Socialists want to keep it from coming until after they have won a nation-wide Socialist victory.

They recall that at the first election in Los Angeles at which women voted, the Socialist ticket was snowed under, and that all the non-Socialist papers attributed it to the women. In short, while the anti-suffragists are declaring suffrage to be a menace because it would bring in Socialism, a large part of the Socialists look upon it as a menace to them, because of woman's conservatism.

"When the antis say that 'all Socialists are suffragists,' it may be true in so far as they are all in favor of it in some ideal future; but many are practical anti-suffragists so far as the actual present is concerned. Some suffragists who had become Socialists are so indignant about it that they have left the Socialist party. Personally, I do not think that this is an adequate reason why any one who believes in the doctrines of Socialism should take such action. The Socialists are no worse in this respect than members of other parties. In states where every party has endorsed woman suffrage, as in New York, we always find some Democrats, some Republicans, and some Progressives who do not live up to that plank in their party's platform. But the anti-suffrage plea that suffrage means Socialism is absurd when we observe how many Socialists are afraid of it—and doubly absurd in view of the actual record of the elections in the enfranchised states."

Gilman? Charlotte Perkins Gilman? Charlotte? Charlotte? Where have we heard that name before?

the increase in the Socialist vote due to woman suffrage is California and the increase in that state was way above the average, from 29,000 to nearly 80,000. And this too with a half-baked Socialistic platform of the Progressive party in the field.

Nor did Miss Blackwell ever hear of any "large part of the Socialists" looking upon woman suffrage as a menace, for they don't, not even one per cent. of them. Why, the Socialist party devotes a page each week in their official organ to the cause of woman suffrage, and the party is spending its cash for this purpose too! What is more, Miss Blackwell, or any other suffragist in the whole United States can't name a single Socialist leader in this country that is not enthusiastic for woman suffrage. Miss Blackwell seems to think that women are conservative. They are just the opposite, especially those who want the vote. Come on your suffragists and tell us about those Socialists who fear women suffrage, who are they and where do they live?

For once in your life at least, Miss Blackwell and "K. T. C.," you are in a hole. Try to get out and see where you will land. And tell us while you are about it whether you repudiate or indorse the Anarchist-Socialistic tactics of the woman suffrage propaganda of England?

F. G. R. GORDON.

Haverhill, Mass., April 30, 1914.

The super-militant suff, now serving a jail sentence of 60 days for threatening to kill young Mr. Rockefeller, started the riot when some shrill voice in the crowd cried out "All that you need is a new spring hat."

A BISHOPS VIEWS ON WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE

The following, received by the "Man-Suffrage Association Opposed to Political Suffrage for Women," is of interest as showing the attitude of one of the Bishops of the Episcopal Church.

THE BISHOP'S HOUSE,
74 Vandeventer Street
St. Louis, Mo.
March 30, 1914.

My Dear Mr. Wheeler:

I have yours of the 25th and I enclose checque for One Dollar for the Man-Suffrage Association.

I have read your "Woman and the Vote" with approval and pleasure.

I have said in many meetings of women—

"Civilized activities—anyway, American activities, move along seven lines: The Home, the School, Society, the Church, Business, Politics, War.

"Scrutinize, and you will find the work done in the first four of them, and the burdens borne and the anxieties suffered, falling in a decidedly major degree to women. And business, to quite a considerable degree is falling to them.

"With the fourfold burdens of the first things enumerated falling to women! and the twofold of the last things falling to men, and with business somewhat divided, already the work and worry and burdens of life seem to weigh twice as heavily upon woman as upon man. If you put the burden of politics also upon her, you are shamelessly shoving five-sevenths of the world's work upon women, and retaining (if business be retained) only two sevenths for the shoulders of men.

"It is not fair to women. To help to save women from the burdens of such unfair partition, I am opposed to woman suffrage, even if women, guided by mistaken judgment, or impelled by mistaken sense of self sacrifice ask that the burden be imposed."

Faithfully and gratefully yours,
(S'g'd) DAN'L S. TUTTLE.

SUFFRAGISM NOT COMING; AND WHY.

A Boston dispatch, evidently by Associated Press, has a very friendly and accurate description of The Remonstrance, the publication issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. Back of this publication are the 23,000 members of the association, who represent 387 cities, towns and villages in Massachusetts, and compose 86 branch committees in a perfect working organization. "When one knows that all of these 23,000 members are women of legal voting age and most of them the wives of prosperous citizens and the mothers of a coming generation he realizes that their protest must carry great weight."

Says the Remonstrance:

"The suffrage movement has not gained a foot of territory through the vote of the male electorate east of the Mississippi River. Not one of the New England States, not one of the Middle States, not one of the Southern States, and not one of the middle Western States, has given full suffrage to women."

Helen Carter grieves over our young man of destiny, (meaning our Mayor Mitchel), as a lost soul. Oh, Helen!

PRESS NEWS AND NOTES

The female-suffrage parade to the capitol in Washington, said by the society organizing it to contain five thousand women, was counted by a committee of men, with both sides represented, who report a grand total, including police, musicians and people in autos, of exactly 1,485. Exclusive of police and musicians there were 1,265 persons in the column, and many of these were children, not to speak of some of them being men.

Hartford, Conn., May 4.

Although the suffragists claim a membership of 21,000 in Connecticut and exerted every effort and spent large sums of money to induce men, women and children to enter the suffrage parade, only 1,246 including police, bandsmen and chauffeurs were started. Of this number 736 were women, 211 chidren and 144 men. One division was composed of a group of socialists, marching behind their red flag, the emblem of revolutionary socialism. After this, will the suffragists assure the people that there is no connection between suffrage and socialism in Connecticut?

Over 7,000 anti-suffrage American Beauty roses were worn on the street during the parade, and there was a demand for more.

Imagine a woman in a hobble skirt enjoying all the rights of man by attempting to rescue a child from a ten-story building on fire!

The Wage-Earners' Anti-Suffrage League will give a river excursion from New York City on Decoration Day, using the largest barge in the world, the Starina, which will leave West 40th St. at 9:30 and be back at 5:30. The activities of the League, as well as its membership, are constantly increasing, and it has been found necessary to establish permanent headquarters in New York, accommodations for the next six months having been engaged at the Students' Inn, 326 West 58th St. The League last week erected a big sign-board at the busiest corner in Brooklyn, bearing this legend: "We believe the men of New York State capable of conducting the government for the benefit of both men and women." Female wage-earners—and men too, for the matter of that—will do well to write for literature to the secretary, Miss Marjorie Dorman.

In a plea for woman suffrage in his paper, "The Masses," Mr. Max Eastman summarizes the platform of the suffrage party this way: "Woman should be made free from all limitations of law, of dogma and of custom." The attention of all readers who think the matter is not of much importance, is respectfully invited.

The women of Pennsylvania held a convention, followed by a mass meeting, at Harrisburg this month, and arranged for a vigorous campaign, covering every county in the state, to kill the suffrage resolution that will probably be